



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

112

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,418	03/23/2004	Ryszard Szczepanik	I272.12-0003	3852
27367	7590	09/27/2007	EXAMINER	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.			NATALINI, JEFF WILLIAM	
SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			2858	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/27/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/807,418	SZCZEPAK ET AL.
	Examiner Jeff Natalini	Art Unit 2858

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

FINAL ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the last line of claim 1 and the second to last line of claim 2 "the mobile objects" is stated, but as mobile was changed to moving in the claims, this should also be changed to "the moving objects". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakhtiari et al. (5886534 and Bakhtiari hereinafter) in view of Gupta (3852743).

In regard to claims 1 and 2, Bakhtiari discloses an apparatus and method of generation and homodyne detection substantially as claimed comprising:

providing electrical paths each having an equal value, the electrical paths between a shunt arm in a waveguide T- connection (i.e. matched hybrid coupler) and a generation diode in one collinear arm [col. 6, lines 51-60] and a detection diode in another collinear arm [col. 6, lines 60-66] such that signals from a microwave antenna that both radiates to and receives signals reflected from an moving objects [i.e. fabric, paper and plastic] (Figs. 1 and 2; col. 4, lines 3-8, 56-58 and 65-67).

Bakhtiari did not expressly disclose such signals being used to provide position and shift information of mobile objects.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bakhtiari, as evidenced by Gupta.

Gupta discloses a homodyne Doppler radar system for detecting targets having such signals being used to provide position and shift information of mobile objects (Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 34-41).

Given the teaching of Gupta, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Bakhtiari by employing the well known or conventional features of radar, such as disclosed by Gupta, in order to increase the detection sensitivity and provide relative target information in the Bakhtiari device.

In regard to claim 3, Bakhtiari discloses an apparatus and method of generation and homodyne detection comprising:

where signals from the single microwave antenna are received by the waveguide T-connection (i.e. matched hybrid coupler) [col. 6, lines 54-58].

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that doppler radar, taught by the secondary reference Gupta, is not used to detect a position or shift in a moving object. In the next sentence of the arguments states the doppler system of Gupta is used to "provide an indication of

the range to a detected target". This range to a detected target, is broadly considered a position, as a position is relative, so this is determining broadly a position in relation to the dopplar sensor (for example, a position of an aircraft in relation to the aircraft with the dopplar radar). As the claim only states position, broadly Gupta discloses providing position of a moving object. Further along in the arguments applicant admits that Gupta teaches "indicating the target velocity (of a moving object) by a visual or audible indication", velocity of an object and the shift of an object are the same thing. A shift in the object is the speed in which the object moves (velocity). Therefore, broadly Gupta indicates position and shift of a moving object.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Natalini whose telephone number is 571-272-2266. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeff Natalini




ANJAN DEB
PRIMARY EXAMINER